



\$~37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 5501/2024**

YUVARAJ VIPAN SARNA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saiib and Mr. Ramnish Khanna,
Advvs.

versus

. **RAHUL SRIVASTAVA & ANR.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashwini Kumar Matta, Sr.
Advocate with Mr. Rajat Aneja, Mr.
Tushar Mathur, Mr. Karan Gaul and
Ms. Garima, Respondent No.1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER

% **22.04.2024**

CM APPL. 22617/2024 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 5501/2024, CM APPLs. 22618/2024, 22619/2024

1. When this Court pointed out that there is a remedy provided under Section 37 of the Advocates Act, learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that since the impugned order has not been passed by the Committee, an appeal might not be maintainable.
2. Be that as it may, on the suggestion given by this Court, learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to approach the Bar Council of India to explore the possibility of the remedy, if any, available in the eyes of law.



3. Permission and liberty, as prayed for, is granted.
4. It is made clear that in case the Bar Council of India chooses not to exercise its jurisdiction on the ground that it is not an appealable order, it is always open for the Petitioner to approach this Court to challenge the impugned order.
5. The petition is disposed of as withdrawn along with pending application(s), if any.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

APRIL 22, 2024

hsk